RELATIONS BETWEEN THE ACADEMIC AND INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITIES

A Speech By
ROBERT RUHL SIMMONS
SATURDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1987

I. INTRODUCTION

LAST MONTH, WHEN JOHN GREANEY INVITED ME TO SPEAK AT THIS SESSION OF THE NATIONAL CONVENTION, I ASKED HIM WHAT EXACTLY THE TOPIC WOULD BE. JOHN RESPONDED THAT DETAILS WOULD BE COVERED IN THE SUMMER EDITION OF PERISCOPE AND THE CONVENTION BULLETIN, BOTH OF WHICH WERE IN THE MAIL.

Needless to say, when the <u>PERISCOPE</u> arrived, I raced to page 10 where it stated that my session of the Convention would concern the need for <u>Dialogue</u> between the academic and intelligence communities.

Several days later the <u>Convention Bulletin</u> arrived, and I noticed a subtle change in language had taken place. The <u>Bulletin</u> said that this session would deal with "the need for <u>cooperation</u> between the Intelligence Community and the Academic Community."

[DIALOGUE AND COOPERATION]

DIALOGUE AND COOPERATION. FOR A TRAINED OBSERVER, WHICH I USED TO BE, AND FOR AN ACADEMIC, WHICH I NOW PRESUME TO BE, THESE TWO WORDS CONVEY TWO DIFFERENT MEANINGS.

THE WORD "DIALOGUE" DERIVES FROM THE GREEK WORD "DIALESGESTHAI" MEANING "TO CONVERSE." THE NOUN FORM "DIALOGOS," OR "DIALOGUE," MEANS A CONVERSATION BETWEEN TWO OR MORE PERSONS; OR AN EXCHANGE OF IDEAS AND OPINIONS.

By contrast, the word "cooperation" derives from the Latin word "opus" meaning "work" and the prefix "co" meaning "common." So the word "cooperation" suggests the action of working, acting or operating together.

IN SHORT, THE WORD "DIALOGUE" CONVEYS A SENSE OF PEOPLE CONVERSING TOGETHER AND EXCHANGING IDEAS. "COOPERATION," BY CONTRAST, SUGGESTS PEOPLE ENGAGED IN SOME FORM OF JOINT ACTION OR OPERATION.

[ACADEMIC VIEWS OF DIALOGUE AND COOPERATION]

I BELIEVE THAT MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY ARE GENERALLY WILLING TO MEET AND DISCUSS INTELLIGENCE ISSUES WITH MEMBERS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY. DEPENDING ON THE

STAT

CIRCUMSTANCES, THEY ARE NOT RELUCTANT TO PARTICIPATE IN A

However, it is altogether different for members of the Academic Community to engage in joint operations with members of the Intelligence Community -- regardless of how benign these operations might initially appear. There is great concern over "cooperation," or in being co-opted in any way.

II. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

THERE ARE TWO PRINCIPLE REASONS FOR THIS CONCERN.

[ACADEMIC FREEDOM DEFINED]

THE FIRST REASON RELATES TO THE CONCEPT OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM. AS DEFINED BY THE ACADEMIC AMERICAN ENCYCLOPEDIA:

"Academic freedom traditionally refers to the freedom of scholars...To teach, publish and engage in research unhindered by others. Those protected by academic freedom, in turn, have the responsibility to conduct research honestly, to report their findings accurately, and to teach without bias. In democratic societies academic freedom is respected as a right. In totalitarian societies, where education is partly directed toward indoctrination, it is rejected.

"THE MODERN CONCEPT OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM HAS ORIGINS IN THE 17TH-AND 18TH-CENTURY MOVEMENT FOR POLITICAL FREEDOM AND FREEDOM OF THOUGHT AND EXPRESSION DEVELOPED DURING THE ENLIGHTENMENT.

"The U.S. Supreme Court has given legal status to academic freedom claims as falling under the 1st Amendment in decisions such as Sweezy v. New Hampshire (1975) and Perry v. Sinderman (1972).

[CHALLENGES TO ACADEMIC FREEDOM]

ALTHOUGH THERE IS A SUBSTANTIAL TRADITION IN SUPPORT OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN THE UNITED STATES, IT HAS BEEN THE TARGET OF REGULAR CHALLENGES. IN COLONIAL TIMES, RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE THREATENED ACADEMIC FREEDOM, WHILE DURING THE LAST CENTURY IT FACED POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC INTIMIDATION FROM POLITICALLY APPOINTED UNIVERSITY TRUSTEES AND WEALTHY BENEFACTORS.

After World War II, academic freedom in the United States was attacked by members of the Congress who feared Possible Communist infiltration of our universities; and in the 1960s, it was threatened from within the campus by students and faculty opposed to the U.S. role in the Vietnam

WAR. VIOLENT DEMONSTRATIONS DISRUPTED MILITARY-RELATED RESEARCH AND ROTC TRAINING PROGRAMS.

III. "HORROR STORIES" OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY/ ACADEMIC COMMUNITY RELATIONS

THE SECOND PRINCIPLE REASON FOR THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY'S CONCERN OVER "COOPERATION" WITH THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY IN VOLVES SOME OF THE PAST HISTORY OF THESE RELATIONS. ACADEMICS BELIEVE THAT THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY HAS IN THE PAST, AND MAY STILL, PRESENT A THREAT TO ACADEMIC FREEDOM.

[INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY THREATS TO ACADEMIC FREEDOM]

I AM SURE EVERYONE IN THE ROOM REMEMBERS THOSE DIFFICULT DAYS IN THE MID-1970S WHEN THE CHURCH AND PIKE COMMITTEES IN CONGRESS, AS WELL AS PRESIDENT FORD'S ROCKEFELLER COMMISSION, CONDUCTED THEIR INQUIRIES AND ISSUED THEIR REPORTS ON ALLEGED IMPROPRIETIES COMMITTED BY THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

STAT

PUBLICIZED A NUMBER OF "HORROR STORIES" WE PROBABLY WISH TO FORGET. I BRING THEM UP ONLY BECAUSE IT IS ESSENTIAL TO UNDERSTANDING WHY MANY MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY ARE COMMUNITY.

[INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS DIRECTED AGAINST ACADEMICS]

A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE ROCKEFELLER COMMISSION REPORT OF JUNE 1975, AND OF THE CHURCH COMMITTEE'S FINAL REPORT OF 1976, REVEALS A NUMBER OF INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS INVOLVING FACULTY AND STUDENTS LOCATED AT U.S. UNIVERSITIES IN THE 1960S AND EARLY 1970S.

THE FOLLOWING EXAMPLES ILLUSTRATE THE POINT:

- -- From 1952 to 1967 the CIA COVERTLY FUNDED
 THE NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION. ALTHOUGH THE CIA'S
 INVOLVEMENT WAS SUPPOSED TO BE LIMITED TO INTERNATIONAL
 ACTIVITIES, INSTANCES WERE FOUND WHERE "THE CIA MOVED FROM
 BLANK-CHECK SUPPORT TO OPERATIONAL USE OF STUDENTS."
 [CHURCH COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT, BOOK I, PAGE 184-185.]
- -- IN 1966 AND 1967, THE OFFICE OF SECURITY AT CIA CREATED FROM 500 TO 800 FILES ON ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS RELATED TO "DISSIDENT ACTIVITY." SOMEWHERE BETWEEN 12,000 AND 16,000 NAMES WERE INDEXED IN THESE FILES. THEY INCLUDED THE NAMES OF DR. S.I. HAYAKAWA OF SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE AND FATHER THEODORE M. HESBURGH OF NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY. [ROCKEFELLER COMMISSION REPORT, PAGE 157.]

ASSOCIATION OF FORMER INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS 13TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION

COINTELPRO OPERATION. ACCORDING TO A MEMORANDUM DATED MAY 9, 1968, ONE JUSTIFICATION FOR THIS OPERATION WAS THAT MEMBERS OF THE ILL-DEFINED "New LEFT" "SCURRILOUSLY ATTACKED THE DIRECTOR AND THE BUREAU" IN AN ATTEMPT TO "HAMPER" FBI INVESTIGATIONS AND TO "DRIVE US OFF THE COLLEGE CAMPUSES."

ON JULY 6, 1968, FIELD OFFICES RECEIVED ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE FROM FBI HEADQUARTERS TO PURSUE THE FOLLOWING

> (1) preparing leaslets designed to discredit student demonstrators, using photographs of New Left leadership at the respective universities. "Naturally, the most obnoxious pictures should be used";

(2) instigating "personal conflicts or animosities" between New Left

leaders;

(8) creating the impression that leaders are "informants for the

Bureau or other law enforcement agencies";

(4) sending articles from student newspapers or the "underground press" which show the depravity of the New Left to university officials, donors, legislators, and parents. "Articles showing advocation of the use of narcotics and free sex are ideal";

(5) having members arrested on marijuana charges;

(6) sending anonymous letters about a student's activities to parents, neighbors, and the parents' employers. "This could have the effect

of forcing the parents to take action"

(7) sending anonymous letters or leaflets describing the "activities and associations" of New Left faculty members and graduate assistants to university officials, legislators, Boards of Regents, and the press. "These letters should be signed 'A Concerned Alumni,' or 'A Concerned Taxpayer'";

(8) using "cooperative press contacts" to emphasize that the "disruptive elements" constitute a "minority" of the students. "The press should demand an immediate referendum on the issue in question";

(9) exploiting the "hostility" among the SDS and other New Left groups toward the SWP, YSA, and Progressive Labor Party;

(10) using "friendly news media" and law enforcement officials to disrupt New Left coffeehouses near military bases which are attempting to "influence members of the Armed Forces":

(11) using cartoons, photographs, and anonymous letters to "ridi-

cule" the New Left; and

(12) using "misinformation" to "confuse and disrupt" New Left activities, such as by notifying members that events have been can-

As noted earlier, the lack of any Bureau definition of "New Left" resulted in targeting almost every anti-war group," and spread to students demonstrating against anything.

[Church Committee Final Report, Book II, page 88-89.]

Memorandum from FBI Headquarters to all SAC's, 7/6/68.

[&]quot;I The New Left supervisor confirmed what the documents reveal: "legitimate" (nonviolent) antiwar groups were targeted because they were "lending aid and

comfort" to more disruptive groups. According to the New Left supervisor:
"This [nonviolent groups protesting against the war] was the type of thing "In a monviolent groups protesting against the war; was the type of thing that the New Left, the violent portion, would seize upon. They could use the legitimacy of an accepted college group or outside group to further their interests." (New Left supervisor, 10/28/75, p. 39)

Nonviolent groups were thus disrupted so there would be less opportunity for a wideling group to make use of them and their respectability. Professors active in

a violent group were thus ensured so there would be less opportunity and a violent group to make use of them and their respectability. Professors active in "New Left matters," whether involved in violence or just in general protest, were targeted for "using [their] good offices to lend aid and comfort to the entire protest movement or to help disrept the school through [their] programs." (New Left appropriate 10.0927K p. 80) Left supervisor, 10/28/75, p. 69.)

-- In late 1969, THE CIA'S OFFICE OF SECURITY AND A DIVISION IN ITS PLANS DIRECTORATE INITIATED PROJECT 2 OF OPERATION CHAOS WHERE INDIVIDUALS WITHOUT PRIOR DISSIDENT AFFILIATION WOULD BE RECRUITED, AND WOULD ACQUIRE THE THEORY AND JARGON AND MAKE ACQUAINTANCES IN THE "NEW LEFT" WHILE ATTENDING SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES. IF INFORMATION CONCERNING DOMESTIC DISSIDENT ACTIVITIES WAS ACQUIRED DURING THIS "REDDENING" OR "SHEEPDIPPING" PROCESS, IT WOULD BE PASSED TO OPERATION CHAOS FOR FORWARDING TO THE FBI. [ROCKEFELLER COMMISSION REPORT, PAGE 138.]

[LASTING MEMORIES OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY COVERT ACTIONS]

CLEARLY THE GOALS OF COINTELPRO WERE TO DISRUPT OR TO PREVENT THE EXERCISE OF FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS ON THE CAMPUS AND ELSEWHERE. IN PARTICULAR, EFFORTS WERE MADE TO PREVENT TEACHING, SPEAKING, WRITING AND PUBLISHING, AND MEETING WHICH ARE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF ACADEMIC ACTIVITY. [CHURCH COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT, BOOK III, PAGES 27-31.]

In addition, teachers and students were identified as unwitting targets of both covert collection and covert action operations by elements of the Intelligence Community. Some teachers and students were wittingly recruited to report on their colleagues.

WHILE IT MAY BE STATED, AND IS PROBABLY TRUE, THAT MANY OF THESE PAST ACTIVITIES OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY WERE AN ABERRATION BROUGHT ON BY THE SOCIAL PRESSURES FOR CIVIL RIGHTS AND BY CONCERN OVER THE VIETNAM WAR, MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY CONTINUE TO REGARD THEM WITH APPREHENSION. THESE EVENTS HAVE MADE A LASTING IMPRESSION ON MANY MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY.

IV. THE CURRENT SITUATION

Now I would like to change the subject a bit, and talk about my own personal experiences as a former intelligence officer currently teaching on campus in Connecticut.

ı	I R	m	ΩR	ΛP	ш	$1 \cap$	n/	TA	1

STAT

[TEACHING AT YALE]

YALE UNIVERSITY. THE MANNER IN WHICH OUR FREE

STAT

AND OPEN SOCIETY MANAGES ITS SECRET ORGANIZATIONS AND ACTIVITIES. IN PARTICULAR, I WAS ASKED TO FOCUS ON HOW THERE CAN BE PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY FOR ORGANIZATIONS AND ACTIVITIES WHICH, BY THEIR VERY NATURE, MUST REMAIN SECRET. THE COURSE, WAS ACCEPTED FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 1985-1986, AND HAS BEEN TAUGHT

WHEN I BEGAN TEACHING AT YALE, I EXPECTED THAT MEMBERS OF THE STUDENT BODY MIGHT BE RELUCTANT TO TAKE A COURSE WITH A FORMER INTELLIGENCE OFFICER. IN FACT, THE OPPOSITE WAS THE CASE. EACH TIME THE COURSE HAS BEEN OFFERED, IT HAS BEEN OVER-SUBSCRIBED BY 300 PER CENT, AND THE REACTION OF STUDENTS HAS BEEN VERY POSITIVE.

BY CONTRAST, AND WITH A FEW NOTABLE EXCEPTIONS, I FOUND THAT THE FACULTY WAS LESS THAN ENTHUSIASTIC. PERHAPS THIS IS TRUE AT ANY INSTITUTION WHERE A NEW FACE ARRIVES. BUT I FOUND THAT WHILE MY COURSE WAS TITLED "CONGRESS AND THE U.S. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY," MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY INVARIABLE REFERRED TO IT AS "THE CIA COURSE." AND THEIR FIRST QUESTION TO ME AT FACULTY MEETINGS WAS USUALLY, "DO YOU STILL WORK FOR THE CIA?"

[IDEOLOGY RATHER THAN GENERATION GAP]

What I have come to realize is that many members of my generation, who were exposed to the civil rights and anti-war movements of the 1960s, and who may have developed negative feelings about the U.S. government as a result, are now teaching. By contrast, most of my students were born in the 1960s, and few of them have any personal recollections of that period.

As a result, the gaps I have encountered at Yale are not so much generation gaps as they are ideological gaps. Many of my students are more conservative than I am when it comes to intelligence issues, while most of the faculty are more liberal. Ideology rather than age differentiates between us.

IV. DIALOGUE AND COOPERATION BETWEEN THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITIES

WITH THIS IN MIND, I WOULD NOW LIKE TO DISCUSS SOME "HYPOTHETICAL" INTERACTIONS BETWEEN THE INTELLIGENCE AND THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITIES, AND GIVE MY APPRAISAL OF THE DEGREE TO WHICH THESE INTERACTIONS ARE ACCEPTABLE ON CAMPUS TODAY. I SAY "HYPOTHETICAL," BECAUSE I AM NOT SURE WHETHER THE EXAMPLES I AM USING HAVE BEEN ACCURATELY DEPICTED IN THE PUBLIC DOMAIN. BOB GATES CAN SPEAK TO THAT.

ALSO, SINCE I DO NOT WISH TO REVEAL ANY CLASSIFIED INFORMATION WITH MY COMMENTS, WHAT FOLLOWS IS BASED ENTIRELY ON PUBLIC SOURCES OF INFORMATION.

ASSOCIATION OF FORMER INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS 13TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION

EARLIER IN THIS TALK I MADE A DISTINCTION BETWEEN "DIALOGUE" AND "COOPERATION." I WOULD LIKE TO CONTINUE TO INTERACTION.

[INTELLIGENCE AND ACADEMIC COMMUNITY DIALOGUES]

FIRST, IN THE AREA OF "DIALOGUES" BETWEEN THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY AND THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY, THERE ARE SEVERAL "HYPOTHETICAL" AREAS OF INTERACTION AS FOLLOWS:

- A. MATRICULATION -- CERTAINLY ONE OF THE MOST OBVIOUS WAYS THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY BENEFITS FROM THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY IS IN THE ADMISSION OF ITS EMPLOYEES TO THE PRIVILEGES OF A COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY. IN THE CASE OF OVERT EMPLOYEES, THIS IS A RELATIVELY SIMPLE PROCESS. WITH COVERT CONSIDERED ON A CASE BY CASE BASIS. NONETHELESS, THIS RELATIVELY BENIGN "DIALOGUE" SEEMS TO HAVE BROAD ACCEPTANCE IN THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY.
- B. CONFERENCES -- INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY SPONSORSHIP OF ACADEMIC COMMUNITY CONFERENCES CAN BE A BENEFICIAL "DIALOGUE" BY CONTRAST, CAN CAUSE PROBLEMS.

For example, last year it was reported in the New York Times that the CIA had provided a Harvard Professor with \$45,700 for a conference on Islamic fundamentalism. Public disclosure of this information resulted in his resignation as the Director of Harvard's Center for Middle Eastern Studies.

C. ACADEMIC STUDIES -- INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY
SPONSORSHIP OF STUDIES, PAPERS, BOOKS AND OTHER ANALYTICAL
PRODUCTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY CAN ALSO BE A
BENEFICIAL "DIALOGUE" IF THE SPONSORSHIP IS OVERT. ONCE
AGAIN, COVERT FUNDING IN THIS AREA RAISES QUESTIONS OF
ACADEMIC FREEDOM, ESPECIALLY IF THE SPONSORING AGENCY PLACES
LIMITS ON THE CONTENT AND THE PUBLICATION OF THE ITEM.

The same Harvard Professor mentioned above was reported by the New York IIMES to have received \$107,430 from the CIA TO WRITE A BOOK TITLED SAUDI ARABIA: THE CEASELESS QUEST FOR SECURITY. DISCLOSURE OF THIS INFORMATION, AND THE SUBSEQUENT MEDIA TREATMENT, WAS REPORTED BY THE PROFESSOR TO HAVE BEEN DAMAGING TO HIS REPUTATION.

Speaking in his defense, the Harvard Professor said that he viewed the CIA as being "Like any other source of funds," and that he felt there was no need to disclose the financing. Obviously, other members of the Academic Community did not share this view. Nor do I. One can reasonably ask, if funds from the CIA are "Like any other sources of funds," why should they not be publicly disclosed?

D. INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS -- A FOURTH "DIALOGUE" BETWEEN THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY AND THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY COULD INVOLVE THE INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS OF AN ISSUE WHERE ACADEMICS ARE PROVIDED ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION. AN EXAMPLE OF THIS SORT OF SITUATION WOULD BE THE "TEAM A-TEAM B" EXERCISE WHICH TOOK PLACE IN 1976 WHERE A GROUP OF OUTSIDE EXPERTS WERE COMMISSIONED BY THE PFIAB TO REVIEW NIES ON THE SOVIET UNION.

OBVIOUSLY, THE DETAILS OF SUCH AN ASSESSMENT WOULD BE KEPT SECRET, WHICH SOME MIGHT CONSTRUE AS A LIMITATION OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM. HOWEVER, THERE IS NO NEED FOR THE ACADEMICS WHO PARTICIPATED TO CONCEAL THEIR INVOLVEMENT IN SUCH AN ACTIVITY WHICH WOULD, IN TURN, PROVIDE AN ELEMENT OF OPENNESS TO THE ENTERPRISE.

Second, IN THE AREA ON "COOPERATION" BETWEEN THE INTELLIGENCE AND THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITYS, THERE ARE A NUMBER OF "HYPOTHETICAL" AREAS OF INTERACTION AS FOLLOWS:

A. RECRUITMENT OF FUTURE EMPLOYEES -- OVER THE YEARS, AGENCIES OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY, TO INCLUDE THE CIA, HAVE CONDUCTED RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES ON CAMPUSES ACROSS THE COUNTRY. USUALLY THESE VISITS ARE ARRANGED IN ADVANCE WITH ACADEMIC COMMUNITY ADMINISTRATORS, THEY ARE ADVERTISED AND THE RECRUITERS ARE CLEARLY IDENTIFIED.

IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THIS FORM OF "COOPERATION" IS ENTIRELY ACCEPTABLE AS LONG AS IT IS CONDUCTED IN THE OPEN. FOR THOSE COLLEGES THAT DO NOT WANT ON-CAMPUS RECRUITMENT, ARRANGEMENTS CAN BE MADE TO DO IT OFF-CAMPUS. I BELIEVE THERE INSTANCES.

B. OVERT COLLECTION OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE -- ACCORDING TO THE ROCKEFELLER COMMISSION REPORT, SINCE 1947 THE CIA HAS COLLECTED INFORMATION FROM AMERICAN CITIZENS TRAVELING ABROAD. Some OF THESE HAVE BEEN ACADEMICS ALTHOUGH THERE WAS A PROHIBITION ON USING FULLBRIGHT SCHOLARS.

As a policy, the CIA has avoided approaching American or foreign students for this purpose, but "will interview them if they initiate the contact." In the past the CIA has asserted that these efforts are devoted entirely to the collection of foreign economic, political, military and operational information, directly related to the U.S. foreign intelligence effort. [Rockefeller Commission Report, pages 209-210.]

This form of "cooperation" has negative implications for some members of the Academic Community. One of the tenets of academic freedom is that scholars be free to conduct their

OWN RESEARCH AND TO LEARN -- WHAT THE GERMANS IN THE 18TH-CENTURY CALLED LEHRNFREIHEIT, OR "FREEDOM OF LEARNING." INSOFAR AS MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY PURSUE THIS FREEDOM THROUGH TRAVEL ABROAD, THE POSSIBILITY THAT THEY MAY REPORT BACK TO THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY CAN LIMIT THEIR INQUIRY AND THAT OF THEIR COLLEAGUES.

On this basis, "cooperative" activities of this nature must not be casually entered into. A determination must be made that the information to be derived from an academic source is potentially more valuable than the loss to academic freedom if this relationship is exposed.

C. COVERT RECRUITMENT OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN STUDENTS/FACULTY AS AGENTS -- ACCORDING TO THE ROCKEFELLER COMMISSION REPORT, A SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC ACTIVITY OF THE CIA CONSISTED OF EFFORTS TO DEVELOP CONTACTS WITH FOREIGN NATIONALS WHO ARE TEMPORARILY WITHIN THE U.S. THE CIA ENLISTED THE VOLUNTARY ASSISTANCE OF AMERICAN CITIZENS IN ITS EFFORTS TO MEET AND DEVELOP CONTACTS WITH THESE FOREIGN NATIONALS. [ROCKEFELLER COMMISSION REPORT, PAGES 220-221.]

ALSO, THE CHURCH COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT STATES THAT "AMERICAN ACADEMICS ARE NOW BEING USED FOR SUCH OPERATIONAL PURPOSES AS MAKING INTRODUCTIONS FOR INTELLIGENCE PURPOSES AND WORKING FOR THE AGENCY ABROAD." [CHURCH COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT, BOOK I, PAGE 190.]

CLEARLY, THE PERCEPTION THAT U.S. AND FOREIGN STUDENTS AND TEACHERS MAY BE EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY HAS SERIOUS IMPLICATIONS FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM. THESE RELATIONSHIPS CREATE MOTIVES FOR TEACHING, LEARNING AND RESEARCH THAT GO WELL BEYOND IDEAS OF LEHRFREIHEIT ("FREEDOM OF TEACHING").

I BELIEVE THAT "COOPERATION" OF THIS SORT CAN ONLY BE JUSTIFIED BY SERIOUS NATIONAL SECURITY CONCERNS OR LIFE-THREATENING CIRCUMSTANCES. I ALSO BELIEVE THAT ANY PROFESSIONAL OR ETHICAL STANDARDS SET BY THE AMERICAN ACADEMIC COMMUNITY IN THIS AREA SHOULD BE RESPECTED.

D. COVERT ACTION -- ACCORDING TO THE CHURCH COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT, THE CIA HAS ENGAGED IN COVERT ACTION ACTIVITIES SPECIFICALLY, PROPAGANDA -- THAT INVOLVED THE NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION, AND SEVERAL U.S. PUBLISHING HOUSES. LCHURCH COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT, BOOK I, PAGES 184-195.]

THE FBI ENGAGED IN COVERT ACTION DESIGNED TO DISRUPT THE ACTIVITIES OF THE "New LEFT"; A TERM "WHICH HAD NO PRECISE DEFINITION WITHIN THE BUREAU," AND WAS CHARACTERIZED BY A SUPERVISOR IN THE FBI'S INTELLIGENCE DIVISION AS "MORE OR LESS AN ATTITUDE, I WOULD THINK." [CHURCH COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT, BOOK II, PAGE 72; BOOK III, PAGE 23.]

Some of these covert action activities involved "COOPERATION" FROM THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY. FOR EXAMPLE, LEADERS OF THE NATIONAL STUDENTS ASSOCIATION WERE AWARE OF THEIR CIA SPONSORSHIP ALTHOUGH THE RANK AND FILE WERE NOT. OTHER ACTIVITIES WERE DIRECTED AGAINST ACADEMICS, AS WAS THE "NEW LEFT" COINTELPRO.

I BELIEVE THAT MOST MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY WOULD FIND THESE ACTIVITIES UNACCEPTABLE IN ANY CIRCUMSTANCES EXCEPT WHERE THE SURVIVAL OF THE NATION IS AT STAKE. IT DOES NOT SEEM TO ME REASONABLE THAT ACADEMICS WOULD ALLOW THIS FORM OF "COOPERATION" OTHERWISE.

VII. CONCLUSION

In concluding my remarks, I would like to say that I BELIEVE THERE IS A NEED FOR BOTH "DIALOGUE" AND "COOPERATION" BETWEEN THE INTELLIGENCE AND THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITIES. THERE ARE CERTAINLY BENEFITS TO BE GAINED BY BOTH PARTIES IF THESE INTERACTIONS TAKE PLACE.

However, This "dialogue" and "cooperation" must be Tailored to our national situation and to the demands of ACADEMIC FREEDOM. CLEARLY, THESE RELATIONSHIPS CHANGE DEPENDING ON WHETHER WE ARE WAGING "HOT" WAR, COLD WAR OR PEACE. AND YES, WE DO NEED INTELLIGENCE TO WAGE PEACE.

ALSO, THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MUST REALIZE THAT "DIALOGUE" AND "COOPERATION" ARE NOT THE SAME. THEY DEMAND DIFFERENT THINGS FROM BOTH COMMUNITIES.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM IS A PRECIOUS ASSET OF OUR FREE COUNTRY. IT RELIES ON MANY THINGS, NOT THE LEAST OF WHICH IS THE CONFIDENCE THAT THE U.S. GOVERNMENT GENERALLY, AND THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY IN PARTICULAR, ARE NOT "PULLING ALL THE STRINGS ON CAMPUS." ACADEMIC FREEDOM THRIVES IN THE OPEN; IT DIES IN THE DARK!

WHILE I AGREE WITH MR. GATES THAT "PRESERVING THE LIBERTY OF THIS NATION IS FUNDAMENTAL TO ... THE PRESERVATION OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM," I ALSO BELIEVE THAT THOUGHTLESS AND POORLY PLANNED INTERACTIONS BETWEEN THE INTELLIGENCE AND THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY CAN DEGRADE THE VERY FREEDOMS THESE "OPERATIONS" WERE DESIGNED TO PROTECT.

LET'S NOT DESTROY ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN ORDER TO SAVE IT!
THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION. I WOULD BE GLAD TO ANSWER
YOUR QUESTIONS.